

REMARKS

The office action of July 28, 2010, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Robotham.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Robotham in view of the patent to Draskovitch et al.

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Robotham in view of the patent to Yoshida.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Robotham and Yoshida in view of Draskovitch et al.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has amended claim 1.

Applicant submits that the subject matter contained in the claims is described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As has been previously argued, the term "roller-burnished" is known in the art and implies a specific structural characteristic of the sealing surface. "Roller-burnished" is used to describe a structural feature of the sealing surface of the sealing ring, just as, for example, a material can be defined to have a "textured", "embossed" "knurled" or "coated" surface.

The roller-burnishing of the cylindrical component describes an entirely unique method for the smoothing and hardening of surface materials. Additionally, special tools are required, which for example have a roughened work surface, as well as a smooth surface, and with an appropriate pressure device that is pressed against the work piece. When pressure is exerted, the pressure device exerts a pressure force in the area of the contact surface between the pressure tool and the work pieces being worked on, which leads to a deformation and simultaneous hardening of the outer surface of the work piece. Depending on

the profiling of the pressure tools, for example: smooth or profiled, a specific surface structure is simultaneously pressed in. These processes are applied usually for the production of for example: knurled screws, to provide the knurling on the screws.

The roller-burnishing describes essentially a process for the production of a particular surface structure, indeed the component and the surface of the component, respectively, produced using said process have an entirely unique surface structure. Hence, Claim 1 device recites that the sealing surface of the sealing ring for roller bearings is roller-burnished, i.e. the sealing ring has a roller-burnished surface. This attribute is thus a structural feature, not simply a process limitation. Although the references teach a hard sealing surface, they do not teach a roller-burnished surface and the structure associated therewith.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on

file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, applicant incorporates herein by reference all of the arguments presented in previous amendments. The references do not teach or suggest a sealing ring having a cylindrical, roller-burnished sealing surface, as in the present invention. The following additional arguments are presented.

The patent to Robotham does not disclose a ring fastened to the neck bush, as in the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, the reference does not disclose a sealing element as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Robotham does not disclose a roller-burnished sealing surface, a ring fastened to the neck bush or a sealing element having two arms that project in a common axial direction, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Draskovich has also been considered. This

reference adds nothing to the teachings of Robotham so as to teach the presently claimed invention as discussed above in connection with claim 1.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Yoshida discloses a seal structure for relatively rotational members. The Examiner combined this reference with Robotham in determining that claims 1 and 3-5 would be unpatentable over such a combination. This combination of references does not teach a roller-burnished sealing surface, a ring fastened to the neck bush or a sealing element having two arms that project in a common axial direction, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Draskovich has also been considered. This

reference adds nothing to the teachings of Robotham and Yoshida so as to teach the presently claimed invention as discussed above in connection with claim 1.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI LLP

By 
Klaus P. Stoffel
Reg. No. 31,668
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
(212) 661-8000

Dated: January 28, 2011

HM-729

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-WEB TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by EFS-web to the Commissioner for Patents on January 28, 2011.

By: 
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: January 28, 2011